

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-vs-)	Case No. M-17-368-STE
)	
JERRY DRAKE VARNELL,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

* * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
HAD ON AUGUST 25, 2017, AT 1:00 P.M.
BEFORE THE HONORABLE SHON T. ERWIN
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE, PRESIDING

* * * * *

MOTION HEARING

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript
produced by computer-aided transcription.

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

A P P E A R A N C E S

ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:

Mr. Matt Dillon
Mr. Mark R. Stoneman
Assistant United States Attorneys
U.S. Attorney's Office
210 West Park Avenue
Suite 400
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT:

Ms. Terri A. Coulter
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 720597
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73172

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

P R O C E E D I N G S

(The following proceedings were had August 25, 2017, with Court, counsel, and defendant present:)

THE COURT: This is USA vs. Jerry Drake Varnell. The case number is M-17-368.

Counsel, if you want to announce your appearances.

MR. DILLON: Matt Dillon and Mark Stoneman for the United States.

MS. COULTER: Terri Coulter appearing with Mr. Varnell.

THE COURT: All right. Before the Court are defendant's unopposed motion for hearing to determine competency to stand trial and abate all scheduled proceedings. That's ECF-10. We've also got -- a later filing we've got defense's motion to withdraw Document No. 10. That's ECF-18. And there is a response to that from the government. And, lastly, we have plaintiff's motion -- the government's motion to determine competency, and that is ECF No. 22.

So two big issues, and that is what happens to the withdrawal of the motion but perhaps the larger issue is whether a competency hearing ought to be ordered.

Any prehearing announcements from the government, Mr. Dillon? Prehearing announcements?

MR. DILLON: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Anything you want to say?

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 All right. Anything from the defense, Ms. Coulter?

2 MS. COULTER: Well, your Honor had in its order
3 indicated that I had until --

4 THE COURT: -- until 1:00.

5 MS. COULTER: -- 1:00 to file a response. I did not
6 receive those until late last night. I have an oral response.
7 I don't have --

8 THE COURT: Certainly. Well, do you want to just
9 incorporate that into your argument later?

10 MS. COULTER: Uh-huh.

11 THE COURT: Is that okay?

12 MS. COULTER: Yes, sir.

13 THE COURT: All right.

14 Mr. Dillon, opening statement?

15 MR. DILLON: Your Honor, the United States' position
16 is simply that the defendant has raised competency pursuant to
17 18 United States Code 4241 and asked for a competency hearing.

18 The Court's order addressed that motion where the
19 defendant sought a hearing pursuant to that and the order --
20 the Court discussed that there was a dispute as to how to
21 proceed under 4241 and 4247, referencing a teleconference that
22 had been had. In that teleconference the United States had
23 discussed that we had wanted a designated neutral and
24 independent evaluator. The defendant had simply wanted -- I
25 believe the words were "time to investigate competency." We

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 know now that the reality was that apparently there was an
2 evaluation had by some unknown expert at some point in time.

3 Our position is that the defendant can't simply withdraw
4 this motion, that the Court needs to make a finding now as to
5 the defendant's competency; that the Court, in making that
6 finding, can't make this finding in an ex parte fashion based
7 on a report that the government is not privy too. We don't
8 believe that's what's contemplated with 4241 and 4247.

9 And that based on that, we are also making a motion
10 for -- again, what we had asked for, an independent evaluation
11 as contemplated by the statute and that the defendant be sent
12 to Bureau of Prisons for that. The statute contemplates a
13 neutral party and that a report be filed with the Court and
14 both parties when an examination is sought. Here an
15 examination was, in fact, conducted. The defendant simply now
16 wishes to essentially walk away from that motion stating that
17 they no longer have concerns. But with the concerns that have
18 been raised and things that occurred after, the government now
19 has its own concerns.

20 We believe that if the independent evaluation had
21 occurred pursuant to statute, the parties would be able to
22 have that evidentiary hearing with evidence that everyone is
23 aware of, that there wouldn't be this report that's unknown to
24 parties and that the Court would be able to make that finding
25 whether it be by stipulation, because parties are aware and

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 would be privy to it, and that everybody would have confidence
2 in those findings and that the Court would be able to make
3 that finding.

4 The entire point, as we state in our brief, is that the
5 Court is the ultimate party -- or person to determine the
6 defendant's ability to see once either party raises a doubt or
7 a concern as to the competency of the defendant to proceed.

8 Just because the defendant now states that they don't
9 have concerns does not alleviate the concerns of the
10 government in this matter. If they are allowed to withdraw
11 this motion, however, that is why we have gone ahead and filed
12 our own motion with our concerns and would ask to proceed with
13 that.

14 THE COURT: All right.

15 Ms. Coulter, opening?

16 MS. COULTER: Your Honor, on August 14th I was
17 appointed to represent Mr. Varnell. Shortly after that day, I
18 became aware that there was a history of paranoid
19 schizophrenic -- schizophrenia. Doing due diligence, I filed
20 Document 10 asking simply for an abatement and a hearing. I
21 did not ask for a competency evaluation, only a hearing. And
22 due diligence required I investigate these issues. I
23 immediately -- also, I might add, I immediately contacted the
24 federal liaison at Grady County Detention Center and faxed him
25 copies of Mr. Varnell's prescription so that he could be

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 competent.

2 Shortly after that I had Mr. Varnell examined by an
3 eminently qualified forensic doctor. The results of that
4 examination were that, in fact, Mr. Varnell is competent to
5 assist his attorney. And I concur in that finding. I have
6 had no problem communicating with him about court proceedings,
7 what is involved in his case, and he understands. So he is
8 ready moving forward.

9 Counsel has provided to the Court to review in camera the
10 credentials of this eminently qualified doctor, and the Court
11 has had an opportunity to review his report. Thus, the
12 Document 18, the motion to withdraw Document 10. I might add
13 that at this time there is no issue of an insanity defense.
14 Those are two separate issues. Competency to assist counsel
15 and insanity defense, two different things, governed by
16 different statutes.

17 I lost my place. Just a second.

18 The government objected to this motion in their Document
19 21 and filed their own motion in Document 22. But in those
20 documents the government states no basis for their motion
21 other than the fact that this counsel had some initial
22 concerns. Those concerns have been resolved. And those
23 concerns have been addressed in a report that the Court has
24 had in camera review of by, once again, an eminently qualified
25 forensic doctor.

1 On page five of government's Document 21, they state:
2 The FBI's investigation, which include a number of recorded
3 conversations involving Mr. Varnell, did not yield facts that
4 would cause serious misgivings about competence.

5 Then the government goes on to talk about the media
6 attention this case has garnered when they are the very ones
7 that created the media attention. It seems the government is
8 now asking for an evaluation because of the media hype that
9 they themselves caused.

10 On page six of Document 21, they said: "The unusually
11 public nature of this prosecution makes it especially
12 important to follow through on a competency hearing." Once
13 again, they are the ones that grandstanded and created the
14 public interest.

15 Unusual public nature of the case is not valid grounds
16 for a competency hearing. The government has said they have
17 no reason to believe he was incompetent. Well, neither does
18 his defense counsel.

19 If the Court were to even consider the government's
20 motion for an evaluation -- for another evaluation to be had,
21 then I would request a separate hearing to decide the
22 parameters of such an evaluation, keeping in mind at all times
23 that Rule 12.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure
24 affords Mr. Varnell protections of his Fifth and Sixth
25 Amendment rights. And the issues that would have to be

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 litigated in such a hearing, first, would be the issue of the
2 fact that competence is a non-adversarial proceeding. It's
3 ultimately a simple investigatory process to aid the Court.
4 The fact that the government claims some right to an equal
5 playing field has no bearing, and it's inapposite.

6 Secondly, it would have to be litigated as to the scope
7 of any disclosures and the future use of any material opinions
8 or evidence to the government.

9 Thirdly, it would have to be litigated, what the scope of
10 any competence evaluation would be allowed. For example, what
11 testing was going to be performed, what use could be made of
12 that testing, and what use could be made of any information
13 gained or reports written from such an evaluation.

14 Fourth, whether or not the evaluation would be locally or
15 at a BOP facility would have to be litigated. There is
16 nothing in the statute that gives the government access to
17 this defendant during the process.

18 Fifth, it would need to be litigated whether all forensic
19 interviews were to be audio and video recorded.

20 And these are just a few of the issues that would need to
21 be litigated in such a hearing if a further evaluation were to
22 be ordered. But, like I have stated, I have no reason to
23 believe Mr. Varnell is not currently competent to assist me.
24 And the government has stated they don't believe he is
25 incompetent either except for their concerns about media

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 scrutiny, which they caused in the first place.

2 Also, as I have previously stated, nothing has been
3 proposed in regard to raising an insanity defense, which is an
4 entirely separate matter from what the government is asking.

5 And, finally, the government, according to their
6 Documents 21 and 22, seem to have a newfound concern for
7 Mr. Varnell's due process rights.

8 I would ask the Court to consider, where was their
9 concern for his due process rate -- rights when the government
10 gave their news conference about this fake bomb plot that they
11 conducted? Where was their concern at their big news
12 conference they gave that they might be poisoning
13 Mr. Varnell's potential jury pool?

14 So I'm telling the Court their argument is disingenuous.

15 A few days ago I requested that I be allowed to view the
16 cargo van with all the fake materials, and I was given an
17 appointment to do so. Although I was informed that it had
18 been partially disassembled. The destruction of evidence is a
19 separate matter.

20 THE COURT: Yeah. Let's stay on point, counsel.

21 MS. COULTER: Well, the point is the government's
22 arguments are disingenuous. They are not cooperating ensuring
23 that Mr. Varnell gets his due process rights by allowing his
24 counsel to view evidence and have access to, for example, the
25 CI's criminal NIC printout.

1 It should be noted that Mr. Varnell's counsel has
2 received numerous calls from the press asking for interviews.
3 I have intentionally refused any such thing because it's in
4 my -- it's my duty to protect his due process rights. And
5 that's exactly what I have done and that I am doing now.

6 So, bottom line, the government's due process arguments
7 are disingenuous and they have no -- they have no right to
8 have access to my client, your Honor. And the Court has
9 received and I presume has reviewed in camera a very
10 well-written report that demonstrates all the testing that was
11 done and firmly establishes this man's competency. And I am
12 ready to move on. That's not an issue anymore.

13 THE COURT: All right.

14 Mr. Dillon, do you have witnesses to call?

15 MR. DILLON: As to this, no. I would like to --

16 THE COURT: Is this going to be all -- this is just
17 going to be all argument?

18 MR. DILLON: As to this. I would like to address a
19 couple of things Ms. Coulter -- but we do not have witnesses
20 as to this issue.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 Ms. Coulter, will you have witnesses?

23 MS. COULTER: No, sir.

24 THE COURT: Okay. All right. I guess that's --
25 it's your turn then.

1 MR. DILLON: Thank you, your Honor.

2 I do find it interesting that she keeps repeating due
3 process and forgets that the United States is a party to this
4 proceeding. She keeps referring to this eminently qualified
5 expert and the fact that the report has only been reviewed in
6 an in camera fashion, and that is in no way a commentary on
7 anything that the Court has done at this point. We are making
8 no comment that anything improper has happened.

9 But 4241 provides in no shape or fashion that that
10 proceeding is to be done nor does it allow for it to be done
11 in an ex parte fashion. Yet that is exactly what she has
12 attempted to do is remove one of the parties to it. In fact,
13 it provides that it's supposed to be for a neutral
14 court-appointed expert if an examination is to occur. It is
15 not for an expert that is, say, designated in some other
16 fashion for a defense. Nowhere have we alleged that this is
17 somehow for an insanity motive for anything else. And we
18 haven't brought up any of these issues.

19 But, again, she wants to talk about press conferences
20 that were had or anything of that, I would only point to the
21 fact that the original motion that brought us here was not
22 filed under seal where there is allegations made concerning
23 the defendant's mental health.

24 Then here today she brings up an appointment to view part
25 of the evidence, a cargo van, which was only canceled because

1 of the rescheduling of this hearing and pleadings. I only
2 bring that up because she brings up disingenuous arguments.
3 She knows where --

4 THE COURT: You get to call her disingenuous once
5 and she's already called you disingenuous once. So let's get
6 that over with and keep moving.

7 MR. DILLON: I just -- I find it confusing in her
8 argument.

9 I think that there is a public interest to know and is
10 allowed by the rule -- and it doesn't happen very often -- for
11 the public to know that there was not a threat actually
12 occurring in this investigation.

13 As far as the actual issues that we're here for though,
14 again, 4241 does not provide for an ex parte proceeding. It's
15 nowhere in that rule. Her concerns to say that we would have
16 to later litigate how another evaluation would occur, I don't
17 actually see that that would actually need to be further
18 litigated because, fortunately, one, 4247 specifically
19 provides in Part (c) exactly what the report should include --
20 or who it should go to, rather. The Rule 12.2 talks about in
21 Part (c)(4), the inadmissibility of the defendant's statements
22 and the limited circumstance that that would ever come in in
23 any other proceeding.

24 All of the concerns that Ms. Coulter has addressed with
25 the Court are already provided by statute. The things that

1 are supposed to be included in a report back to the Court are
2 covered by statute. I think that the issue of whether an
3 interview with the defendant in this proceeding would be
4 recorded -- or, I'm sorry -- in an interview would be
5 recorded, it might have been the *Loughner* case that I think
6 both parties are aware of through discussion -- I think that
7 that was actually addressed in that case.

8 THE COURT: Is that the case that I sent you all?

9 MR. DILLON: Yes. So I don't see anything that
10 would need further litigation that has been brought up by
11 counsel today.

12 The public interest that is here, though, is to make sure
13 that there would not be a repetition in any proceeding, that
14 there is a full faith that there is competence in this
15 defendant, that this report that has been turned over, that
16 there is transparency going on, that both parties have faith
17 in it, that the public has faith, that everything has been
18 fully vetted, that there are no more concerns.

19 And while I can appreciate that Ms. Coulter says that she
20 is now satisfied, quite frankly, the government can't be
21 because we haven't been privy to anything. And that is the
22 issue is that 4241 does not allow for this type of procedure.

23 THE COURT: All right.

24 Ms. Coulter, I will give you the last word.

25 MS. COULTER: Your Honor, the government has no

1 right to my work product. The Court has an independent duty
2 to review a report of whether he's able to assist counsel
3 under the statute. And competency is in itself a
4 non-adversarial issue, does not give the government rights to
5 my work product. And, finally, the allegations concerning the
6 defendant's mental health were already in the public domain
7 before I ever filed anything.

8 That's it, Judge. He is competent.

9 THE COURT: This is not a hearing to determine
10 whether Mr. Varnell is competent to stand trial. This is a
11 hearing to determine whether a competency hearing is needed.

12 Title 18 United States Code Section 4241 says if there is
13 reasonable cause -- remember that phrase -- reasonable cause
14 to believe that Mr. Varnell's presently suffering from a
15 mental disease or defect rendering him mentally incompetent to
16 the extent that he is unable to understand the nature and
17 consequences of these proceedings against him and to properly
18 assist in his defense -- I am looking for reasonable cause.

19 Now, if we ever get to a competency hearing the standard
20 is different. It's preponderance of the evidence. So what I
21 am trying to figure out here is whether there is reasonable
22 cause. If I find it then I will order a psychological
23 examination of Mr. Varnell at a suitable facility. That's
24 what the statute contemplates. Once the examination is
25 complete and the reports are received, a competency hearing

1 will be held.

2 Now, this -- in my experience, this occurred in an
3 unusual way. First defense files a motion under 4241. And
4 4241 is very specific and it's a road map. And you ring that
5 bell and we know what to do. You order the psychological
6 evaluation by -- usually by the Bureau of Prisons. And we
7 know what needs to be in the report.

8 But that's not what was intended by Ms. Coulter. That
9 became apparent a few days later. Sealed motions were filed,
10 approvals were given, and a psychological examination was
11 conducted. This will probably never happen again because the
12 government is wise to it, but personally I think it was
13 pretty -- it's unusual the way this happened and quite clever
14 because you got your psychological evaluation. I am not sure
15 you knew what the findings were going to be, but you got
16 findings that support the idea that your client is competent
17 to stand trial.

18 But I think more is needed here. And let me explain why.
19 Mr. Varnell's -- let me get rid of the -- your motion to
20 withdraw your Document 10 is granted. I know you don't want
21 this to be your motion for a competency examination, so that
22 motion is granted and you're allowed, Ms. Coulter, to withdraw
23 Document 10.

24 Now, as I read the statute -- again, I am at Title 18
25 United States Code Section 4241(a) -- there are three ways

1 that this can happen. "This" being the ordering of the
2 psychological examination. First and usually we get a joint
3 motion from the defense and from the government. In this
4 case, we got one from the defense, which is now gone. We got
5 one -- we now have one pending from the government. But
6 failing that, the Court, on its own motion, can decide to
7 order a psychological evaluation. But we do have a pending
8 motion from the government.

9 So when I consider Mr. Varnell's prior mental health
10 history, including hospitalizations, a diagnosis of
11 schizophrenia, auditory hallucinations, depression, anxiety,
12 mental health history that is serious enough that an Oklahoma
13 district judge has found you incompetent to manage your own
14 affairs resulting in your parents being appointed as your
15 guardian -- I understand that's a different standard, but it's
16 compelling.

17 The in camera -- in camera -- I am throwing around --
18 what "in camera" means is that the Judge gets to look at it
19 but nobody else. That's what in camera examination of
20 documents mean. So I did. I thoroughly read the report, and
21 the report is compelling on the issue of competence. And at a
22 later competency hearing I'm sure it's going to come up. We
23 will probably argue about whether it needs to be disclosed to
24 the defense or not, but that's for another day.

25 But the psychological report prepared, though compelling

1 on the issue of competence, only presents a snapshot view of
2 Mr. Varnell's competence to stand trial. It was based on a
3 two-hour examination at the Grady County Detention Center.
4 Hardly a suitable facility for such an examination.

5 Mr. Varnell deserves better. He deserves -- and,
6 frankly, due process demands better for you. You need a more
7 thorough study conducted over a period of weeks at a suitable
8 BOP facility specializing in cases such as yours.

9 So my ruling, based on the evidence presented, including
10 documents presented by the defendant and reviewed in camera by
11 the Court, and also the pretrial services report, the argument
12 of counsel, I find there is reasonable cause to believe that
13 Mr. Varnell is presently suffering from a mental disease or
14 defect rendering him mentally incompetent to the extent he is
15 unable to understand the nature and consequences of the
16 proceeding -- the proceedings against him or to properly
17 assist in his defense.

18 So plaintiffs -- the government's motion for hearing to
19 determine competency, ECF No. 22, is granted.

20 So it is ordered -- and I will follow this up with a
21 written order -- Mr. Varnell, you are committed to the custody
22 of the Attorney General for a reasonable period not to exceed
23 30 days -- my understanding is they are running a little
24 longer than 30 days; under the statute, it can be up to 45
25 days -- for an examination by at least one qualified

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 psychiatrist or psychologist to determine whether you may
2 presently be suffering from a mental disease or defect
3 rendering you mentally incompetent to the extent you are
4 unable to understand the nature and consequences of the
5 proceedings against you or to properly assist in your defense.

6 It's further required the examiner shall prepare and file
7 with the Court the reports prescribed in Title 18 United
8 States Code Section 4247(c). And my order will reflect
9 exactly what's in the statute.

10 Counsel, if you want to argue about recordings, audio or
11 video recordings, just submit your request to me. If my order
12 needs to be clarified in any way, let me know.

13 So -- Ms. Coulter?

14 MS. COULTER: I am specifically making the request
15 that any interviews conducted be video and audio recorded.

16 THE COURT: Any objection from the government?

17 MR. DILLON: Only I think -- again, I think it was
18 pursuant to that *Loughner* case that I think that Court found
19 that if it's recorded it's provided to both parties.

20 THE COURT: But you would probably like that
21 sentence in the order, wouldn't you?

22 MS. COULTER: Yes, sir.

23 THE COURT: All right. We'll include it then, there
24 being no objection from the government.

25 Any clarifications to my order that you know about yet?

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123

1 Ms. Coulter, anything else?

2 MS. COULTER: Not yet, but I will study it.

3 THE COURT: Yeah. Let's -- let me -- I will get the
4 order to you today.

5 MS. COULTER: If the Court could wait until Monday
6 to sign it, I would like an opportunity to do a little
7 research if I might.

8 THE COURT: I am going to file it today because I
9 want -- I want to get the -- get things moving and get him out
10 of here and get him evaluated and get him back. So --

11 MS. COULTER: I will get right on it.

12 THE COURT: Okay. All right. The -- obviously, we
13 cannot now have a preliminary hearing nor can we have a
14 detention hearing because we've got an issue as to
15 Mr. Varnell's competence. So are there -- are there -- so
16 those hearings are canceled until further order of the Court.

17 Additional clarifications needed?

18 MR. DILLON: No, your Honor.

19 THE COURT: Or from the defense? I know something
20 is coming but --

21 MS. COULTER: Not at this time.

22 THE COURT: -- not at this time. All right.

23 We are in recess.

24 (Proceedings concluded at 1:35 p.m.)

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2 I, Christina L. Clark, Federal Official Realtime Court
3 Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the
4 Western District of Oklahoma, do hereby certify that pursuant
5 to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code that the
6 foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the
7 stenographically reported proceedings held in the
8 above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is
9 in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference
10 of the United States.

11
12 Dated this 9th day of September, 2017.

13
14 s/CHRISTINA L. CLARK
15 Christina L. Clark, RPR, CRR
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHRISTINA L. CLARK, RPR, CRR
United States Court Reporter
200 N.W. Fourth Street, Suite 5419
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
christina_clark@okwd.uscourts.gov - ph(405)609-5123